





# A STUDY <sup>OF</sup> <sub>THE</sub> CENSUS

SHOWING HOW

## New Population in California

Distributed Itself Between 1880 and 1890.

---

An Address Before the State Board of Trade, December 13, 1892.

. . BY . .

GEN'L. N. P. CHIPMAN,

OF RED BLUFF, CALIFORNIA.

---

ISSUED BY THE STATE BOARD OF TRADE.

---

"PACIFIC RURAL PRESS" PRINT,

1893.

For general information concerning the State of California, apply to the California State Board of Trade,

E. W. MASLIN, SECRETARY,

602 MARKET STREET,

San Francisco, Cal.

# A STUDY OF THE CENSUS.

*Hon. Eugene J. Gregory, President State Board of Trade.*—SIR: The growth of the great West has been marked by a large increase of rural population. Large cities and prosperous towns have grown up with its development, but the strength and power of the West have resulted from the rapid increase of the farming population. Wherever agriculture has been the basis of wealth, the lands have been first occupied in small holdings and the towns built up later or *pari passu*. There is no reason why this law should have been, or still should be, reversed in this State. The wealth of California lies in her soil and its capabilities, under our strikingly favorable climatic influences.

The Census Bulletin No. 134, issued by the Government, gave us a table of the counties of the State, whose population was enumerated. It compared 1880 with 1890, showing increase and decrease in the several counties and total increase for the decade. It also gave in detail the population in townships and towns and cities; but no attempt was made to trace the people to their homes, or to show by arranged data the relative increase or decrease in town and country, nor to bring into comparison the drift of population in respect of the different localities of the State.

I have undertaken to separate the tables and rearrange the data so as to show the relative increase in town and country, my purpose being to discover where the increase has gone and what deductions may be drawn from the facts.

The analysis which I shall give will show that we have gained of rural population in ten years only 78,113, while the towns and cities have gained 265,323, or over 77 per cent. More than one third of the entire increase has gone into the three cities of San Francisco, Los Angeles and Oakland.

## GAINS AND LOSSES FOR A DECADE.

The following table gives the distribution of our population as shown by the census of

1890, compared with 1880, and locates the increase for the decade:

County.	1890.	1880.	Gain or Loss in County.	Gain in Towns.	Gain or Loss in Country.
Alameda.....	93,864	62,976	30,888	30,888	.....
Alpine.....	667	539	128	69	59
Amador.....	10,320	11,884	a 1,064	.....	.....
Butte.....	17,939	18,721	a 782	.....	.....
Calaveras.....	8,882	9,094	a 212	.....	.....
Colusa.....	14,640	13,118	1,522	1,178	349
Contra Costa.....	13,515	12,525	990	495	495
Del Norte.....	2,592	2,584	8	4	4
El Dorado.....	9,232	10,683	a 1,451	.....	.....
Fresno.....	32,076	9,478	22,545	12,218	10,330
Humboldt.....	23,469	15,512	7,957	3,731	4,226
Inyo.....	3,544	2,925	616	308	308
Kern.....	9,808	5,601	4,207	2,861	1,346
Lake.....	7,101	6,596	505	916	b 411
Lassen.....	4,239	3,346	899	266	633
Los Angeles.....	101,454	24,802	76,652	56,572	20,080
Orange.....	13,589	8,579	5,010	3,544	1,466
Marin.....	13,072	11,324	1,748	1,872	b 124
Mariposa.....	3,787	4,339	a 552	.....	.....
Mendocino.....	17,612	12,890	4,722	4,035	777
Merced.....	8,085	5,556	2,429	563	1,866
Modoc.....	4,986	4,399	587	293	294
Mono.....	2,002	7,499	a 5,497	.....	.....
Monterey.....	18,637	11,302	7,335	2,665	4,670
Napa.....	16,411	13,235	3,175	1,005	2,171
Nevada.....	17,369	20,828	a 3,454	.....	.....
Placer.....	15,101	14,232	869	1,160	b 291
Plumas.....	4,933	6,180	a 1,247	.....	.....
Sacramento.....	40,339	34,390	5,949	5,679	270
San Bernardino.....	25,497	7,786	17,711	11,204	6,507
San Benito.....	6,412	5,584	828	177	651
San Diego.....	34,987	5,018	26,369	15,829	10,540
San Francisco.....	298,997	239,959	65,038	65,038	.....
San Joaquin.....	28,629	24,349	4,280	5,922	b 1,642
San Luis Obispo.....	16,072	9,142	6,930	8,314	3,616
San Mateo.....	10,087	8,669	1,418	28	1,390
Santa Barbara.....	15,751	9,513	6,241	3,401	2,840
Santa Clara.....	48,005	35,039	12,966	7,181	5,828
Santa Cruz.....	19,270	12,802	6,468	2,796	3,672
Shasta.....	12,133	9,492	2,641	2,077	564
Siskiyou.....	12,163	8,610	3,553	1,029	2,520
Sierra.....	5,051	6,623	a 1,572	.....	.....
Solano.....	20,916	18,475	2,471	2,424	47
Sonoma.....	32,721	25,926	6,795	3,413	3,383
Stanislaus.....	10,040	5,751	4,289	2,199	b 904
Sutter.....	5,469	5,159	310	183	125
Tehama.....	9,916	9,301	615	751	b 136
Trinity.....	3,719	4,999	a 1,280	.....	.....
Tulare.....	24,671	11,281	13,293	5,429	7,867
Tuolumne.....	6,082	7,848	a 1,766	.....	.....
Ventura.....	10,071	5,073	4,998	2,271	2,727
Yuba.....	12,684	11,772	912	882	80
Yolo.....	9,636	11,284	a 1,648	.....	.....
Total.....	1,208,130	64,694	363,961	265,323	102,148
Total Loss.....	.....	.....	a 20,625	.....	b 2,568
Net Gain.....	.....	.....	343,436	.....	.....

NOTES.—a, Counties showing loss;

b, Lost in country where gain in country.

I find no evidence of any great increase of rural growth in Alameda, and as the subdivisions are not clearly noted, I treat the increase as practically all in the towns and cities.

Six counties of small increase I could not compare, as the data were incomplete; and I divided the increase equally between town and country. With these exceptions, the tables are practically accurate and reliable.

#### SMALL INCREASE IN THE COUNTRY.

Certain localities, by thoughtfully considering these results, will find ample cause to bestir themselves, while other localities will find full justification for all they have done in the way of promoting development.

The unpleasant fact will appear that the net increase of 343,436 for the whole State can be found in only a few of the counties, while some—the richest in natural resources and advantages—have gained but little or not at all. Of this increase, 195,965 have gone into cities and towns of over 3000 inhabitants and many more into the smaller villages.

The result of the tables is, that while we have added 345,436 to the mass of our population, we have added since 1880 to the towns 265,323, which leaves only 78,113 added to the country population.

In some counties there has been an increase in the population of the towns, but the county as a whole has decreased. Butte county is an example. The town of Chico has gained 1237, while the county as a whole has lost 782. Amador has 1064 less population than in 1880, but her towns have increased 1093.

It will appear also that in some cases the counties have gained in population, but the gain has all and more gone into the towns, showing an actual loss to the country of rural population. San Joaquin county is an example. The towns in that county have gained 5922, while the country has lost 1642. That is, the difference between the gain in the whole county and the gain in the towns shows an actual loss in the country.

The two columns of actual gain in towns and gain in rural population together aggregate 367,469, which number, as shown in my tables exceeds the actual gain in the whole State by 24,033. Twelve counties, shown by the tables, lost 20,525 of these, and six counties fell off in rural population 3508, while gaining in the towns that number more than the total gain in the counties; and this accounts for the apparent excess in the column of rural increase.

Twelve counties have lost an aggregate of

20,525 population. Some of these have doubtless left the State; but the larger part have gone to the other counties, and reappear as new population there. It was the closing down of the mining industries that largely caused this hegira.

The tables show a large disproportionate gain in the cities and towns. The country has gained only 22.7 per cent, while the cities and towns have gained 77.3 per cent. Anyone familiar with the conditions existing in California will see that this is an unhealthy distribution of our increase.

#### CONFINED TO FEW COUNTIES.

Looking more in detail, we find that a few counties have received nearly all this increase of rural population.

The following list shows that 96,860 of the rural population have gone into 19 counties, and 5286 have gone into 14 counties, making 102,146 in all for 33 counties. The actual increase of rural population for the whole State, however, was only 78,113; and this means that 24,033 have shifted, leaving their former homes, going into other counties, or have left the State and been replaced by new people who have settled in the growing counties. The table is as follows:

#### COUNTIES GAINING RURAL POPULATION.

County.	Over 1,000	County.	Less Than 1,000.
Fresno.....	10,330	Alpine.....	59
Humboldt.....	4,226	Colusa.....	349
Kern.....	1,846	Contra Costa.....	495
Los Angeles.....	20,080	Del Norte.....	4
Merced.....	1,866	Inyo.....	308
Monterey.....	4,670	Mendocino.....	777
Napa.....	2,171	Lassen.....	633
Orange.....	1,466	Modoc.....	294
San Bernardino.....	6,507	Sacramento.....	870
San Diego.....	10,540	San Benito.....	651
San Luis Obispo.....	3,616	Shasta.....	564
San Mateo.....	1,198	Solano.....	47
Santa Barbara.....	2,837	Sutter.....	155
Santa Clara.....	5,828	Yolo.....	80
Santa Cruz.....	3,672		
Sonoma.....	3,888		
Siskiyou.....	2,530		
Tulare.....	7,867		
Ventura.....	2,727		
Total gain.....	96,860	Total gain.....	5,286

Some interesting regional groups may be made that teach some obvious lessons. Bear in mind, I am dealing only with increased rural population.

#### Group 1.

##### SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA—SOUTH OF TEHACHAPI.

Los Angeles.....	20,080
Orange.....	1,466
San Bernardino.....	6,507
San Diego.....	10,540
San Luis Obispo.....	3,616
Santa Barbara.....	2,837
Ventura.....	2,727
Total.....	47,773

## Group 2.

CENTRAL—A PART OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA—COUNTIES  
NORTH TO SAN JOAQUIN.

Kern.....	1,346	
Tulare.....	7,867	
Presno.....	10,330	
Merced.....	1,866	
San Joaquin valley—total.....		21,409
San Benito.....	651	
Monterey.....	4,670	
Santa Cruz.....	3,672	
San Mateo.....	1,198	
Santa Clara.....	5,828	
Coast south of San Francisco—total.....		16,019
Sonoma.....	3,828	
Napa.....	2,171	
Contra Costa.....	495	
Solano.....	47	
Around San Francisco bay—total.....		6,096
Total.....		43,524

## Group 3.

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA—COUNTIES NORTH TO SHASTA.

Sacramento.....	870	
Yolo.....	80	
Colusa.....	349	
Sutter.....	155	
Shasta.....	564	
Sacramento valley—total.....		2,018
Mendocino.....	777	
Humboldt.....	4,226	
Del Norte.....	4	
Coast north of San Francisco—total.....		5,007
Total.....		7,025

## Group 4.

SCATTERING.

Alpine.....	59	
Inyo.....	308	
Lassen.....	633	
Modoc.....	294	
Siskiyou.....	2,530	
Mountain counties—total.....		3,824
Total.....		3,824

These groups show that seven counties of southern California have received 61 per cent of the entire increase of rural population in the State—a very significant fact.

## LOS ANGELES AND ORANGE.

My tables also correct an apparent error of the census table in treating Los Angeles county. Orange county was formed in 1889, and all the population there found was placed in the column of increase for that county in 1890. The fact is, that by consulting the census of 1880 we find 8579 of this increase for 1890 were in the same territory in 1880. In giving the increase for Los Angeles, the census bulletin treats this number, 8579, as in Los Angeles county in 1880; and thus diminishes the increase in the latter county. I have in my tables dealt with Orange fairly, but have deducted these 8579 from her apparent increase; thus correctly showing what has taken place in the territory comprising the two counties, and thus giving Los Angeles the full credit to which it is entitled.

The tables, however, enable one to see the exact status of each county, and it is also

easy to arrive at certain deductions, which fact gives the tables their value.

## A SPLENDID GROUP.

It will be noticed that group two embraces a region containing every attraction known to California—the charming valleys of Santa Clara, Napa, Sonoma, Salinas, all of the San Joaquin valley, the delightful suburban valleys around the bay of San Francisco, and the widely known watering places of Santa Cruz and Monterey; it embraces also the country where the bulk of the deciduous fruits and the cereals of the State are produced; a region, too, within the direct and immediate influence of our metropolis, and comprising an available area very much greater than that of southern California; and yet these 13 counties have added to their rural population 4249 less than the seven counties south of Tehachapi.

It is noticeable that some rich and attractive counties are not in the list and show no rural increase. San Joaquin and Stanislaus are conspicuous by their absence, when their high merit is considered.

## A DISCOURAGING EXHIBIT.

Turning to group three we find a still more discouraging exhibit. Leaving out Mendocino, Del Norte and Humboldt counties, as situated on the coast and separated from the other counties of the group by a high mountain range, and we have an increase of rural population of the the entire Sacramento valley, only 2018.

And this result is reached by leaving out of consideration Yuba and Butte counties, whose aggregate loss in ten years was 2430, which would wipe out the gain I have shown for the whole valley. This, however, was a loss of miners, and hence I give the valley the benefit. Otherwise it would appear that the Sacramento valley has 402 less rural population than in 1880, and I suppose accurately speaking this is the true situation.

## STAGNATION IN THE VALLEY.

There is much to encourage the counties in Group 2, but what can be said to explain the utter stagnation in the counties lying in the Sacramento valley? Sacramento, Yolo, Colusa, Glenn, Yuba, Sutter, Placer, Butte, Tehama and Shasta, counties possessing every attraction to the home-seeker that can be found elsewhere in the State, have

not added one-third as many rural population as the single mountain county of Siskiyou.

Little Inyo, tucked away in the heart of the Sierras, and accessible by rail only by the way of Carson City, Nev., has grown more than Sutter and Yolo put together, and about as much as imperial Colusa, with all her boasted primacy as a wheat-producer.

Alpine, hedged in by mountain cliffs and reached by snowshoes in winter, with a total population of only 667, gained as much as Yolo, of whose county seat it is said that it contains the wealthiest per capita population of any town in the United States.

And yet in this group of laggards will be found the largest vineyard in the world and the largest orchards of deciduous fruit trees in the State. The orange groves of Marysville, Colmena, Palermo, Oroville and Placer attest a climate similar to that of famous Riverside. All that beauty of scenery and picturesqueness of landscape can add to a country fertile as the fattest lands of the State, is here present to invite intending settlers, but they have not and do not come. I claim the right to speak thus plainly of my own home.

#### WHAT ARE THE REASONS?

There is some reason why Fresno has gained 10,330 of population in ten years, and Tulare 7867, while San Joaquin and Stanislaus have gained none, and Merced only about one-tenth as many as Fresno—all lying side by side in the same great valley and surrounded by similar conditions of soil and climate.

There is some reason why the splendid counties of Sacramento, Yolo and Solano, through which every visitor to San Francisco from the North or East must pass, has added less than 1000 to their agricultural population in ten years.

I will not at this point attempt to give the reason, lest I break the force of the facts I am pressing upon public attention; those most concerned should search it out and apply the remedy, as should be done elsewhere as well.

The foregoing appears chiefly from the face of the census. Going outside and consulting facts known to us all, and we are able to make some further important deductions.

The rural or agricultural growth has gone where the fruit industry has developed or is being developed largely, and it has shunned the exclusively wheat-growing counties.

Turn back and consult the tables, and in every case, with a very few exceptions, where there has been substantial increase you will find a county where fruit is the distinctive attraction. The exceptions are cases not involving agricultural development; as, for example, Siskiyou and Humboldt counties, where the lumber interest brought the people in large part. In no instance will you find any growth worth mentioning in the rural districts where wheat-farming is the leading industry. Generally in such districts there is an actual loss of population and decadence of prosperity. The towns have grown in some counties, but the country has not.

#### GREAT GAINS IN SEVEN COUNTIES.

It will be seen, also, that while 61 per cent of our rural increase is in the seven counties south of the Tehachapi mountains; the balance is nearly all south of a line drawn east and west through the city of Sacramento.

It is worth our while to search out the reason for this. It does not lie in soil or climate; the conditions both of soil and climate are even more favorable north of this line than south of it, by reason of similar conditions generally, and with the added comparative cheapness of lands and increased rainfall north of the line which makes irrigation unnecessary to grow fruits successfully. What is the cause?

#### TWO CONTROLLING REASONS.

Primarily, I attribute it to large land-holdings and a failure or unwillingness of the owners to subdivide and invite immigration.

Another potent cause is the absence of competition in transportation lines, by reason of which there has not been that stimulus on the part of carriers, so energizing in the south, to promote immigration and create new business.

Without the data, I cannot state more than my belief: but my belief is, that the agricultural tonnage has not increased in the Sacramento valley in the past ten years,

whereas it ought to have more than doubled. Leaving out the fruit shipments, I think there can be no doubt about the agricultural tonnage having fallen off, and this is a reproach to the people of the region as well as to transportation companies. But whether or not tonnage has decreased, the fact remains that the people do not increase, and without people we cannot have prosperity and growth.

#### THE PEOPLE ARE UNENTERPRISING.

Still another, and by no means the least important cause lies within the resident population itself which does practically nothing to improve upon existing conditions, or to show the capabilities of soil and climate. It has been demonstrated in this State that the genesis of every successful attempt to attract buyers and bring in settlers has been the local effort of citizens. In no instance have strangers alone come in advance and possessed the country and developed it. The local people have always made the first advancement and demonstrated their faith by their works. Fresno is a typical and honorable example of this fact. Southern California is a resplendent monument to the local enterprise of her people.

Scattered over the north are large plantings, but there has been no community of effort looking to immigration. General Bidwell at Chico has probably 1500 acres of orchards; Governor Stanford at Vina, 3500 acres of vines; Mr. A. T. Hatch and his associate, 1700 acres of orchards at Biggs, and 600 acres near Cottonwood, and 1000 at Susan, besides other plantings. Other large orchards might be named, and many smaller ones; but trees do not grow people, and large orchards do not imply increased population.

While as a board we represent the whole State, and have always avoided the promotion, invidiously, of one section over another, is it not our plain duty when we see causes at work to retard any particular portion of the State, to point them out and lend our assistance to their removal?

#### ADVANTAGES OF THE NORTH.

The absolute truth about northern California is, that in some respects it offers greater inducements to the settler who desires to engage in our leading industry of fruit-growing than any other portion of the State at this time.

Lands are cheaper; the climate is favorable to the growth of all our fruits; irrigation is not a necessity; the region is healthful; the landscape surroundings are cheerful and picturesque; the country is well watered; river navigation is practicable to the upper end of the Sacramento valley; a railroad traverses the country on each side of the river; the lands are fertile and bring fruit trees rapidly into bearing; the valley has no disadvantage, save its heat in summer, which is no greater than in all our valleys remote from the sea, and this disadvantage only adds somewhat, but no great deal, to the discomfort of living for two or three months of the year, while having its compensation in growing and curing our fruits. Notwithstanding the large land-holdings to which I have alluded, there are many thousands of acres of excellent land for sale at low prices in almost every county.

I think we have a right to point out this condition, as we know it to exist; and while we would not divert a single person from other parts of the State, we may, with entire propriety, say, as a Board, that no reason exists why northern California should not receive a large population.

#### THE FACTS MUST BE FACED.

There is this to be said in justification for making the exhibit I have presented as graphic as possible. It brings the condition squarely before our people; it corrects false impressions and dispels false hopes; it answers the class which has claimed that we have been doing well enough—basing their opinions on unrelated data, and appropriating results attained by others. It will be a surprise to many to find how they have failed to attract any of our increase of population.

San Joaquin and Stanislaus will begin to inquire why the people have gone past their doors without even stopping to bid them good morning, and have settled down in Fresno and Tulare. The people of the Sacramento valley will ask why it is that 343,436 inhabitants have settled in the State during the past ten years, and only 2018 have cast their lot with them. If the germ of public spirit and patriotism and enterprise has not died out utterly, it will—or certainly should—awaken our slumbering energies and arouse our latent activities.

And withal, I maintain that this very expose will be a safe and true guide-board for the intending settler who is not able to pay high prices for land, but would prefer to go where his labor will not only give him the same returns as he would get elsewhere, but will give him the added value to his land that must come to him if he settles in the less undeveloped regions. In the favored counties land has reached a high figure, if not its maximum; in the counties referred to not yet developed, the settler will have the benefit of the rise in values that will surely attend rapid growth.

#### RAILROADS SHOULD HELP.

The facts brought out by these tables suggest some important considerations to the transportation companies. If it be true, as the foregoing would seem to demonstrate, that the fruit industry is destined to be the leading agricultural industry of the State; if it be true that to it is due largely the increase of our agricultural population, the plainest principles of business interest would require the railroad companies to promote this growing industry in every way consistent with fair returns for the service. And the relief and encouragement must come, not alone in lower rates, but rather in prompt and expedited service.

#### INCREASES OF A DECADE

We shipped East by rail in 1880, 546 carloads of fruit; in 1891 it had increased to 17,738 carloads, excluding wine and brandy. This large addition to the business of carriers in shipping our fruit is but a part of the added traffic. It has brought with it increased passenger traffic and all the varied and profitable business of distribution of supplies to this army of fruitgrowers. We have but to study the evolution of southern California to see how enormously the freight and passenger business has grown under the direct and immediate influence of the fruit industry. It would seem to me that the plainest dictates of ordinary business sagacity would bring the fruitgrowers and the transportation companies into the most intimate and friendly relations, and that there should be no attempt on the part of one to overreach the other.

To say that the future successful development of fruit-growing depends upon its treatment by the railroad companies is only to repeat what is patent to us all. To say that

they would deliberately enforce a policy detrimental to or destructive of the industry is to attribute a degree of ignorance to their managers which we know they do not possess. We therefore speak with the same plainness and frankness to the railroad companies as we do to ourselves when dealing with the lessons to be drawn from this study of the census. A common interest suggests certain obvious steps to be taken by railroad managers as well as by the people. Southern California and portions of central California have done well, and are doing well. Let us be thankful for that. Northern California needs the earnest, intelligent effort and best energies of her most influential citizens, and especially does it need something more than the mere operation of trains on the part of the only railroad company we have; it needs its direct efforts to promote immigration.

There is no single sound reason why, with the mutual and zealous cooperation of these two forces (the people and the railroad company working to a common end) we should not rapidly add to our population, develop new business and increase the prosperity of this portion of the State.

I have been led, Mr. President, to lay this matter before this Board because it seems to be within the province of my committee, and because I am deeply impressed with the belief that there are causes at work to retard the growth of portions of the State that ought to be sought out and remedied.

#### PEOPLE SHOULD AROUSE THEMSELVES.

I think the facts should have the widest circulation among our own people, in order that they may be stimulated to search the remedy and apply it. It may not be pleasing to delinquent counties to see their shortcomings thus exposed, but the true friend of progress never fears the truth, but rather welcomes it. I have the same unshaken faith in northern California that has kept me there at work in my humble sphere for 16 years, proud of the development at the south and elsewhere, but always hopeful that the splendid resources of the north would have recognition.

I believe that there will soon be an awakening among the people of this region, and that we shall at no distant day enjoy the higher civilization that always attends the expansion and development of a country so intrinsically meritorious and so deservedly inviting as northern California.

Trusting that my labor—and it has been no easy task in thus presenting the results of immigration to the State for the past decade—may awaken inquiry, and that it may lead to greater effort where it now plainly appears it is most needed, this report is respectfully submitted.



